arXiv:1304.5911v1 [math.OC] 22 Apr 2013

A REFINEMENT OF THE GENERALIZED CHORDAL DISTANCE

AMOL SASANE

Abstract. For single input single output systems, we give a refinement $d_{c,r}$ of the generalized chordal metric d_c introduced in [8]. Our metric $d_{c,r}$ is given in terms of coprime factorizations, but it coincides with the extension of Vinnicombe's ν-metric given in Ball and Sasane [1] if the coprime factorizations happens to be normalized. The advantage of the metric $d_{c,r}$ introduced in this article is its easy computability (since it relies only on coprime factorizations, and does not require *normalized* coprime factorizations). We also give concrete formulations of our abstract metric for standard classes of stable transfer functions.

1. Introduction

The Vinnicombe ν-metric introduced in [10] and its abstract version given in [1] both rely on finding *normalized* coprime factorizations. This is a troublesome aspect of the theory, since

1. Although merely coprime factorizations may exist, a *normalized* coprime factorization may fail to exist: for example in the article [9] by Sergei Treil, it was shown that the set plants in the field of fractions of the disk algebra possessing normalized coprime factorizations is strictly contained in the set of plants possessing coprime factorizations.
2. Even if they exist, normalized coprime factorizations might be impossible to find using a constructive procedure: for example, in the paper [6] by Jonathan Partington and Gregory Sankaran, it is shown that in the case of delay systems, in general the relevant spectral factorizations for finding normalized coprime factorizations cannot be determined by solving any finite system of polynomial equations over the field $\mathbb{R}(s, e^s)$.

The goal in this paper is to show that this problematic feature of the ν-metric can be eliminated, at least in the case of single input single output systems, by redefining the ν-metric, which relies only on coprime factorizations, rather than *normalized* coprime factorizations. The starting point is the generalized chordal distance d_c introduced in [8] given in terms of coprime factorizations, and then considering a refinement $d_{c,r}$ of this chordal distance akin to the ν-metric d_ν. It turns out that the metric $d_{c,r}$ coincides with the ν-metric if one has normalized coprime factorizations at hand. But since our metric is in fact only defined using coprime factorizations, the burden of working with normalized coprime factorizations is completely eliminated. Our main results are then that $d_{c,r}$ defines a metric on the set of all elements admitting a coprime factorization, and stabilizability is a robust property of the plant. The precise statements of the results are given in Theorems 2.3 and 2.5, after the notation has been introduced in the next section.

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 93B36; Secondary 93D15, 46J15.

Key words and phrases. ν-metric, robust control, Banach algebras.

2. SETUP AND PRELIMINARIES

Our setup is the following:

- (A1) R is commutative integral domain with identity.
- (A2) S is a commutative C^*-algebra such that $R \subset S$, that is there is an injective ring homomorphism $I : R \to S$.
- (A3) Let inv S to denote the invertible elements of S. There exists a map $\iota : \text{inv } S \to G$, where $(G, +)$ is an Abelian group with identity denoted by $\circ$, and ι satisfies
  - (I1) $\iota(ab) = \iota(a) + \iota(b)$ $(a, b \in \text{inv } S)$.
  - (I2) $\iota(a^*) = -\iota(a)$ $(a \in \text{inv } S)$.
  - (I3) ι is locally constant, that is, ι is continuous when G has the discrete topology.
  - (I4) $\mathbf{x} \in R \cap (\text{inv } S)$ is invertible as an element of R if and only if $\iota(\mathbf{x}) = \circ$.
  - (I5) If $\mathbf{x} \in S$ and $\mathbf{x} > 0$, then $\iota(\mathbf{x}) = \circ$.

(A3) allows identification of elements of R with elements of S. So in the sequel, if $\mathbf{x}$ is an element of R, we will simply write $\mathbf{x}$ (an element of S!) instead of $I(\mathbf{x})$. A consequence of (I3) is the following homotopic invariance of the index [1, Proposition 2.1], which we will use in the sequel. (I4) is to be thought of as an abstract Nyquist criterion. We also remark that there are salient differences in the setup in [1] versus the above. In particular, we take S to be a C^*-algebra, whereas in [1], S was a Banach algebra, and also the condition (I5), which is critically used in our proofs, was missing in the framework of [1].

Proposition 2.1. *If $H : [0, 1] \to \text{inv } S$ is continuous, then $\iota(H(0)) = \iota(H(1))$.*

We also introduce the following standard notation and terminology:

$\mathbb{F}(R)$ denotes the field of fractions of R. Given $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{F}(R)$, a factorization

$$\mathbf{p} = \frac{\mathbf{n}}{\mathbf{d}},$$

where $\mathbf{n} \in R$, $\mathbf{d} \in R \setminus \{0\}$, is called a *coprime factorization of* $\mathbf{p}$ if there exist $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in R$ such that

$$\mathbf{nx} + \mathbf{dy} = 1.$$

We denote by $\mathbb{S}$ the set of all elements in $\mathbb{F}(R)$ that possess a coprime factorization.

The maximal ideal space of S is denoted by $M(S)$. If $\mathbf{x} \in S$, then we denote by $\widehat{\mathbf{x}}$ the Gelfand transform of $\mathbf{x}$. Also, by the Gelfand-Naimark Theorem [7, Theorem 11.18],

$$\|\mathbf{x}\|_S = \|\widehat{\mathbf{x}}\|_{S,\infty} = \max_{\varphi \in M(S)} |\widehat{\mathbf{x}}(\varphi)|.$$

Let $\mathbf{p}_1, \mathbf{p}_2 \in \mathbb{S}(R)$ have coprime factorizations

$$\mathbf{p}_1 = \frac{\mathbf{n}_1}{\mathbf{d}_1} \text{ and } \mathbf{p}_2 = \frac{\mathbf{n}_2}{\mathbf{d}_2}.$$

Then the *chordal pointwise distance function* $\kappa_{\mathbf{p}_1,\mathbf{p}_2}$ is

$$\kappa_{\mathbf{p}_1,\mathbf{p}_2}(\varphi) := \frac{|\widehat{\mathbf{n}_1}(\varphi)\widehat{\mathbf{d}_2}(\varphi) - \widehat{\mathbf{n}_2}(\varphi)\widehat{\mathbf{d}_1}(\varphi)|}{\sqrt{|\widehat{\mathbf{n}_1}(\varphi)|^2 + |\widehat{\mathbf{d}_1}(\varphi)|^2}\sqrt{|\widehat{\mathbf{n}_2}(\varphi)|^2 + |\widehat{\mathbf{d}_2}(\varphi)|^2}}, \quad \varphi \in M(S).$$

The function κ given by the above expression is well-defined, that is, it does not depend on the choice of coprime factorizations for each of the plants; see [8].

Definition 2.2. For $\mathbf{p}_1, \mathbf{p}_2 \in \mathbb{S}$, with coprime factorizations

$$\mathbf{p}_1 = \frac{\mathbf{n}_1}{\mathbf{d}_1}, \quad \mathbf{p}_2 = \frac{\mathbf{n}_2}{\mathbf{d}_2},$$

we define

$$d_{c,r}(\mathbf{p}_1, \mathbf{p}_2) := \begin{cases} \|\kappa_{\mathbf{p}_1,\mathbf{p}_2}\|_{S,\infty} & \text{if } \mathbf{n}_1^*\mathbf{n}_2 + \mathbf{d}_1^*\mathbf{d}_2 \in \text{inv } S \text{ and } \iota(\mathbf{n}_1^*\mathbf{n}_2 + \mathbf{d}_1^*\mathbf{d}_2) = \circ, \\ 1 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{2.1}$$

$d_{c,r}$ given by (2.1) is well-defined, and it is bounded above by 1. It is also clear that if the two plants have *normalized* coprime factorizations, that is, if also

$$\mathbf{n}_1^*\mathbf{n}_1 + \mathbf{d}_1^*\mathbf{d}_1 = 1 = \mathbf{n}_2^*\mathbf{n}_2 + \mathbf{d}_2^*\mathbf{d}_2,$$

then it is clear that $d_{c,r}(\mathbf{p}_1, \mathbf{p}_2) = d_\nu(\mathbf{p}_1, \mathbf{p}_2)$, where d_ν is the extension of the ν-metric defined in [1]. We note however, that d_ν was defined on the set $\mathbb{S}_n$ of elements in the field of fractions possessing a normalized coprime factorization, and for some rings R (for example $R = A(\mathbb{D})$, the disk algebra; see [9]), it may be the case that $\mathbb{S}_n \subsetneq \mathbb{S}$.

Our first main result is the following:

Theorem 2.3. *$d_{c,r}$ is a metric on $\mathbb{S}$.*

We will also show that stabilizability is a robust property of the plant and give the quantitative version of this in Theorem 2.5 below. But first, we have the following definition of the stability margin.

Definition 2.4. Given $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{F}(R)$, we say that $\mathbf{c} \in \mathbb{F}(R)$ *stabilizes* $\mathbf{p}$ if

$$\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{c}) := \begin{bmatrix} \dfrac{-\mathbf{pc}}{1-\mathbf{pc}} & \dfrac{\mathbf{p}}{1-\mathbf{pc}} \\ \dfrac{-\mathbf{c}}{1-\mathbf{pc}} & \dfrac{1}{1-\mathbf{pc}} \end{bmatrix} \in R^{2\times 2}.$$

We define the *stability margin* $\mu_{\mathbf{p},\mathbf{c}}$ of $\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{c} \in \mathbb{F}(R)$ by

$$\mu_{\mathbf{p},\mathbf{c}} = \begin{cases} \dfrac{1}{\|\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{c})\|_{S,\infty}} & \text{if } \mathbf{c} \text{ stabilizes } \mathbf{p}, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Here for a matrix $M \in S^{p\times m}$ with entries from S, we set

$$\|M\|_{S,\infty} = \sup_{\varphi \in M(S)} \left|\!\left| \widehat{M}(\varphi) \right|\!\right|,$$

where $\widehat{M}$ denotes the matrix obtained by taking entrywise Gelfand transforms, and $|\!|\cdot|\!|$ denotes the induced operator norm when $\mathbb{C}^p, \mathbb{C}^m$ are equipped with the usual Euclidean norms.

Theorem 2.5. *If $\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{p}_0, \mathbf{c} \in \mathbb{S}$, then $\mu_{\mathbf{p},\mathbf{c}} \geq \mu_{\mathbf{p}_0,\mathbf{c}} - d_{c,r}(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{p}_0)$.*

In order to show Theorem 2.5, the following fact will be useful.

Lemma 2.6. *If $\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{c} \in \mathbb{S}$ have coprime factorizations $\mathbf{p} = \dfrac{\mathbf{n}_p}{\mathbf{d}_p}$ and $\mathbf{c} = \dfrac{\mathbf{n}_c}{\mathbf{d}_c}$, then*

$$\mu_{\mathbf{p},\mathbf{c}} = \inf_{\varphi \in M(S)} \frac{|\widehat{\mathbf{n}}_p(\varphi)\widehat{\mathbf{n}}_c(\varphi) - \widehat{\mathbf{d}}_p(\varphi)\widehat{\mathbf{d}}_c(\varphi)|}{\sqrt{|\widehat{\mathbf{n}}_p(\varphi)|^2 + |\widehat{\mathbf{d}}_p(\varphi)|^2}\sqrt{|\widehat{\mathbf{n}}_c(\varphi)|^2 + |\widehat{\mathbf{d}}_c(\varphi)|^2}}.$$

Proof. The claim follows from the observations that

$$\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{p},\mathbf{c}) = \frac{1}{\mathbf{d}_p\mathbf{d}_c - \mathbf{n}_p\mathbf{n}_c}\left[\begin{array}{c}\mathbf{n}_p\\ \mathbf{d}_p\end{array}\right]\left[\begin{array}{cc}-\mathbf{n}_c & \mathbf{d}_c\end{array}\right]$$

and

$$\left\| \left[\begin{array}{c}\widehat{\mathbf{n}}_p(\varphi)\\ \widehat{\mathbf{d}}_p(\varphi)\end{array}\right]\left[\begin{array}{cc}-\widehat{\mathbf{n}}_c(\varphi) & \widehat{\mathbf{d}}_c(\varphi)\end{array}\right]\right\| = \sqrt{|\widehat{\mathbf{n}}_p(\varphi)|^2+|\widehat{\mathbf{d}}_p(\varphi)|^2}\sqrt{|\widehat{\mathbf{n}}_c(\varphi)|^2+|\widehat{\mathbf{d}}_c(\varphi)|^2},$$

for $\varphi \in M(S)$. □

It follows from the above that $\mu_{\mathbf{p},\mathbf{c}} \leq 1$. Also, $\mu_{\mathbf{p},\mathbf{c}} = \mu_{\mathbf{c},\mathbf{p}}$.

Proposition 2.7. *Let* $\mathbf{p},\mathbf{c} \in \mathbb{S}$ *have coprime factorizations*

$$\mathbf{p} = \frac{\mathbf{n}_p}{\mathbf{d}_p} \text{ and } \mathbf{c} = \frac{\mathbf{n}_c}{\mathbf{d}_c}.$$

Then the following are equivalent:

(1) $\mathbf{c}$ *stabilizes* $\mathbf{p}$.
(2) $\mathbf{n}_p\mathbf{n}_c - \mathbf{d}_p\mathbf{d}_c \in \text{inv } S$ *and* $\iota(\mathbf{n}_p\mathbf{n}_c - \mathbf{d}_p\mathbf{d}_c) = \circ$.

Proof. Suppose that $\mathbf{c}$ stabilizes $\mathbf{p}$. Then it can be seen that $\mathbf{n}_p\mathbf{n}_c - \mathbf{d}_p\mathbf{d}_c$ belongs to inv R. It follows from (I4) that $\mathbf{n}_p\mathbf{n}_c - \mathbf{d}_p\mathbf{d}_c \in \text{inv } S$ and that $\iota(\mathbf{n}_p\mathbf{n}_c - \mathbf{d}_p\mathbf{d}_c) = \circ$.

On the other hand, if $\mathbf{n}_p\mathbf{n}_c - \mathbf{d}_p\mathbf{d}_c \in \text{inv } S$ and $\iota(\mathbf{n}_p\mathbf{n}_c - \mathbf{d}_p\mathbf{d}_c) = \circ$, then again by (I4), we obtain that $\mathbf{n}_p\mathbf{n}_c - \mathbf{d}_p\mathbf{d}_c \in \text{inv } R$. It follows from here that $\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{p},\mathbf{c})$ has each entry in R. □

The following elementary fact will be used often in our proofs.

Lemma 2.8. *For complex numbers* a, b, α, β, *such that* $|a|^2 + |b|^2 > 0$ *and* $|\alpha|^2 + |\beta|^2 > 0$ *there holds that*

$$1 - \frac{|a\beta - b\alpha|^2}{(|a|^2+|b|^2)(|\alpha|^2+|\beta|^2)} = \frac{|a\overline{\alpha} + b\overline{\beta}|^2}{(|a|^2+|b|^2)(|\alpha|^2+|\beta|^2)}.$$

The proof of Theorems 2.3 and 2.5 are analogous to the proofs given in [10] (in the case when R is the ring of rational functions bounded in the right hanf complex plane) and the proofs given in [1] (in an abstract setting). However, Theorems 2.3 and 2.5 are not automatic, and do not follow from [1], since we consider a more general setting than the one considered in [1] (merely coprime factorizations versus normalized coprime factorizations).

3. d_ν IS A METRIC

Proof of Theorem 2.3. The fact that $d_{c,r}$ is nonnegative is trivial. Also, if $d_{c,r}(\mathbf{p}_1,\mathbf{p}_2) = 0$, then it is clear that $\mathbf{p}_1 = \mathbf{p}_2$. Symmetry is also easy to check. We only check the triangle inequality. Suppose that $\mathbf{p}_1, \mathbf{p}_2, \mathbf{p}_0 \in \mathbb{S}$. We want to show that

$$d_{c,r}(\mathbf{p}_1,\mathbf{p}_2) \leq d_{c,r}(\mathbf{p}_1,\mathbf{p}_0) + d_{c,r}(\mathbf{p}_0,\mathbf{p}_2).$$

Since $d_{c,r}$ is bounded above by 1, this inequality is trivially satisfied if either $d_{c,r}(\mathbf{p}_1,\mathbf{p}_0) = 1$ or $d_{c,r}(\mathbf{p}_0,\mathbf{p}_2) = 1$. So we assume that $d_{c,r}(\mathbf{p}_1,\mathbf{p}_0) < 1$ and $d_{c,r}(\mathbf{p}_0,\mathbf{p}_2) < 1$. Let

$$\mathbf{p}_0 = \frac{\mathbf{n}_0}{\mathbf{d}_0}, \quad \mathbf{p}_1 = \frac{\mathbf{n}_1}{\mathbf{d}_1}, \quad \mathbf{p}_2 = \frac{\mathbf{n}_2}{\mathbf{d}_2},$$

be coprime factorizations. If $\mathbf{n}_1^*\mathbf{n}_2 + \mathbf{d}_1^*\mathbf{d}_2 \in \text{inv } S$ and if $\iota(\mathbf{n}_1^*\mathbf{n}_2 + \mathbf{d}_1^*\mathbf{d}_2) = \circ$, then the inequality follows from the triangle inequality in $\mathbb{R}^3$, that is from the triangle inequality for the generalized chordal metric; see [8].

So we will assume that $\neg\Big[\mathbf{n}_1^*\mathbf{n}_2+\mathbf{d}_1^*\mathbf{d}_2 \in \text{inv } S \text{ and } \iota(\mathbf{n}_1^*\mathbf{n}_2+\mathbf{d}_1^*\mathbf{d}_2)=\circ\Big]$. Let

$$\begin{array}{rcl} A & := & \underbrace{(\mathbf{n}_1^*\mathbf{n}_0+\mathbf{d}_1^*\mathbf{d}_0)}_{\in \text{inv } S}\underbrace{(\mathbf{n}_0^*\mathbf{n}_2+\mathbf{d}_0^*\mathbf{d}_2)}_{\in \text{inv } S} \in \text{inv } S, \\ B & := & (-\mathbf{n}_1^*\mathbf{d}_0^*+\mathbf{d}_1^*\mathbf{n}_0^*)(-\mathbf{d}_0\mathbf{n}_2+\mathbf{n}_0\mathbf{d}_2). \end{array}$$

Suppose that $\|A^{-1}B\|_{S,\infty}<1$. Then

$$(\mathbf{n}_1^*\mathbf{n}_2+\mathbf{d}_1^*\mathbf{d}_2)\cdot\underbrace{(|\mathbf{n}_0|^2+|\mathbf{d}_0|^2)}_{\in \text{inv } S}=A+B=\underbrace{A(1+A^{-1}B)}_{\in \text{inv } S},$$

and so $\mathbf{n}_1^*\mathbf{n}_2+\mathbf{d}_1^*\mathbf{d}_2\in \text{inv } S$. Let $H:[0,1]\to \text{inv } S$ be defined by $H(t)=A(1+tA^{-1}B)$, $t\in[0,1]$. By the homotopic invariance of the index, $\iota(A)=\iota(H(0))=\iota(H(1))=\iota(A+B)$. But $\iota(A)=\circ+\circ=\circ$. And using (I5), $\iota(A+B)=\iota(\mathbf{n}_1^*\mathbf{n}_2+\mathbf{d}_1^*\mathbf{d}_2)+\circ$. Thus $\iota(\mathbf{n}_1^*\mathbf{n}_2+\mathbf{d}_1^*\mathbf{d}_2)=\circ$, a contradiction.

So it can't be the case that $\|A^{-1}B\|_{S,\infty}<1$. Since $M(S)$ is compact, it follows from here that there exists a $\varphi_0\in M(S)$ such that $|\widehat{B}(\varphi_0)|\geq|\widehat{A}(\varphi_0)|$. Using Lemma 2.8, we obtain that

$$\begin{array}{rl} & \Big(1-(\kappa_{\mathbf{p}_0,\mathbf{p}_1}(\varphi_0))^2\Big)\Big(1-(\kappa_{\mathbf{p}_0,\mathbf{p}_2}(\varphi_0))^2\Big) \\ = & \dfrac{|\widehat{A}(\varphi_0)|^2}{\Big(|\widehat{\mathbf{n}}_0(\varphi_0)|^2+|\widehat{\mathbf{d}}_0(\varphi_0)|^2\Big)^2\Big(|\widehat{\mathbf{n}}_1(\varphi_0)|^2+|\widehat{\mathbf{d}}_1(\varphi_0)|^2\Big)\Big(|\widehat{\mathbf{n}}_2(\varphi_0)|^2+|\widehat{\mathbf{d}}_2(\varphi_0)|^2\Big)} \\ \leq & \dfrac{|\widehat{B}(\varphi_0)|^2}{\Big(|\widehat{\mathbf{n}}_0(\varphi_0)|^2+|\widehat{\mathbf{d}}_0(\varphi_0)|^2\Big)^2\Big(|\widehat{\mathbf{n}}_1(\varphi_0)|^2+|\widehat{\mathbf{d}}_1(\varphi_0)|^2\Big)\Big(|\widehat{\mathbf{n}}_2(\varphi_0)|^2+|\widehat{\mathbf{d}}_2(\varphi_0)|^2\Big)} \\ = & \Big(\kappa_{\mathbf{p}_0,\mathbf{p}_1}(\varphi_0)\Big)^2\cdot\Big((\kappa_{\mathbf{p}_0,\mathbf{p}_2}(\varphi_0)\Big)^2. \end{array}$$

Upon rearranging, we obtain $(\kappa_{\mathbf{p}_0,\mathbf{p}_1}(\varphi_0))^2+(\kappa_{\mathbf{p}_0,\mathbf{p}_2}(\varphi_0))^2\geq 1$, and so

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \Big(d_{c,r}(\mathbf{p}_0,\mathbf{p}_1)+d_{c,r}(\mathbf{p}_0,\mathbf{p}_2)\Big)^2 & = & \Big(\kappa_{\mathbf{p}_0,\mathbf{p}_1}(\varphi_0)+\kappa_{\mathbf{p}_0,\mathbf{p}_2}(\varphi_0)\Big)^2 \\ & \geq & \Big(\kappa_{\mathbf{p}_0,\mathbf{p}_1}(\varphi_0)\Big)^2+\Big(\kappa_{\mathbf{p}_0,\mathbf{p}_2}(\varphi_0)\Big)^2 \\ & \geq & 1=\Big(d_{c,r}(\mathbf{p}_1,\mathbf{p}_2)\Big)^2. \end{array}$$

This completes the proof of the triangle inequality, and also the proof of Theorem 2.3. □

4. Stabilizability is a robust property

Proof of Theorem 2.5. If $d_{c,r}(\mathbf{p},\mathbf{p}_0)\geq\mu_{\mathbf{p}_0,\mathbf{c}}$, then trivially we have

$$\mu_{\mathbf{p},\mathbf{c}}\geq 0\geq\mu_{\mathbf{p}_0,\mathbf{c}}-d_{c,r}(\mathbf{p},\mathbf{p}_0).$$

So let us suppose that $d_{c,r}(\mathbf{p},\mathbf{p}_0)<\mu_{\mathbf{p}_0,\mathbf{c}}$. Since $\mu_{\mathbf{p}_0,\mathbf{c}}\leq 1$, it follows that $d_{c,r}(\mathbf{p},\mathbf{p}_0)<1$. Also, $\mu_{\mathbf{p}_0,\mathbf{c}}\neq 0$, since otherwise we would have $d_{c,r}(\mathbf{p},\mathbf{p}_0)<0$, which is impossible. So

$\mu_{\mathbf{p}_0,\mathbf{c}} > 0$. Hence $\mathbf{c}$ stabilizes $\mathbf{p}_0$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} d_{c,r}(\mathbf{p},\mathbf{p}_0) &= \sup_{\varphi\in M(S)} \frac{|\widehat{\mathbf{n}}_p(\varphi)\widehat{\mathbf{d}}_{p,0}(\varphi) - \widehat{\mathbf{n}}_p(\varphi)\widehat{\mathbf{d}}_{p,0}(\varphi)|}{\sqrt{|\widehat{\mathbf{n}}_p(\varphi)|^2+|\widehat{\mathbf{d}}_p(\varphi)|^2}\sqrt{|\widehat{\mathbf{n}}_{p,0}(\varphi)|^2+|\widehat{\mathbf{d}}_{p,0}(\varphi)|^2}} \\ &< \inf_{\varphi\in M(S)} \frac{|\widehat{\mathbf{n}}_{p,0}(\varphi)\widehat{\mathbf{n}}_c(\varphi) - \widehat{\mathbf{d}}_{p,0}(\varphi)\widehat{\mathbf{d}}_c(\varphi)|}{\sqrt{|\widehat{\mathbf{n}}_{p,0}(\varphi)|^2+|\widehat{\mathbf{d}}_{p,0}(\varphi)|^2}\sqrt{|\widehat{\mathbf{n}}_c(\varphi)|^2+|\widehat{\mathbf{d}}_c(\varphi)|^2}} \\ &= \mu_{\mathbf{p}_0,\mathbf{c}}. \end{aligned}$$

So for all $\varphi \in M(S)$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{|\widehat{\mathbf{n}}_p(\varphi)\widehat{\mathbf{d}}_{p,0}(\varphi) - \widehat{\mathbf{n}}_p(\varphi)\widehat{\mathbf{d}}_{p,0}(\varphi)|}{\sqrt{|\widehat{\mathbf{n}}_p(\varphi)|^2+|\widehat{\mathbf{d}}_p(\varphi)|^2}\sqrt{|\widehat{\mathbf{n}}_{p,0}(\varphi)|^2+|\widehat{\mathbf{d}}_{p,0}(\varphi)|^2}} \\ < \; & \frac{|\widehat{\mathbf{n}}_{p,0}(\varphi)\widehat{\mathbf{n}}_c(\varphi) - \widehat{\mathbf{d}}_{p,0}(\varphi)\widehat{\mathbf{d}}_c(\varphi)|}{\sqrt{|\widehat{\mathbf{n}}_{p,0}(\varphi)|^2+|\widehat{\mathbf{d}}_{p,0}(\varphi)|^2}\sqrt{|\widehat{\mathbf{n}}_c(\varphi)|^2+|\widehat{\mathbf{d}}_c(\varphi)|^2}}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.1}$$

Using the elementary result in Lemma 2.8, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{|(\widehat{\mathbf{d}}_{p,0}(\varphi))^*\widehat{\mathbf{n}}_c(\varphi) + (\widehat{\mathbf{n}}_{p,0}(\varphi))^*\widehat{\mathbf{d}}_c(\varphi)|}{\sqrt{|\widehat{\mathbf{n}}_c(\varphi)|^2+|\widehat{\mathbf{d}}_c(\varphi)|^2}\sqrt{|\widehat{\mathbf{n}}_{p,0}(\varphi)|^2+|\widehat{\mathbf{d}}_{p,0}(\varphi)|^2}} \\ < \; & \frac{|(\widehat{\mathbf{n}}_{p,0}(\varphi))^*\widehat{\mathbf{n}}_p(\varphi) + (\widehat{\mathbf{d}}_{p,0}(\varphi))^*\widehat{\mathbf{d}}_p(\varphi)|}{\sqrt{|\widehat{\mathbf{n}}_{p,0}(\varphi)|^2+|\widehat{\mathbf{d}}_{p,0}(\varphi)|^2}\sqrt{|\widehat{\mathbf{n}}_p(\varphi)|^2+|\widehat{\mathbf{d}}_p(\varphi)|^2}}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.2}$$

Since all quantities in the inequalities (4.1), (4.2) are positive, we may multiply them to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & |(\widehat{\mathbf{d}}_{p,0}(\varphi))^*\widehat{\mathbf{n}}_c(\varphi) + (\widehat{\mathbf{n}}_{p,0}(\varphi))^*\widehat{\mathbf{d}}_c(\varphi)||\widehat{\mathbf{n}}_p(\varphi)\widehat{\mathbf{d}}_{p,0}(\varphi) - \widehat{\mathbf{n}}_p(\varphi)\widehat{\mathbf{d}}_{p,0}(\varphi)| \\ < \; & |(\widehat{\mathbf{n}}_{p,0}(\varphi))^*\widehat{\mathbf{n}}_p(\varphi) + (\widehat{\mathbf{d}}_{p,0}(\varphi))^*\widehat{\mathbf{d}}_p(\varphi)||\widehat{\mathbf{n}}_{p,0}(\varphi)\widehat{\mathbf{n}}_c(\varphi) - \widehat{\mathbf{d}}_{p,0}(\varphi)\widehat{\mathbf{d}}_c(\varphi)| \end{aligned} \tag{4.3}$$

Define

$$\begin{aligned} A &:= \underbrace{(\mathbf{n}_{p,0}^*\mathbf{n}_p + \mathbf{d}_{p,0}^*\mathbf{d}_p)}_{\in \text{inv } S \text{ as } d_{c,r}(\mathbf{p},\mathbf{p}_0)<1} \cdot \underbrace{(-\mathbf{n}_c\mathbf{n}_{p,0} + \mathbf{d}_c\mathbf{d}_{p,0})}_{\in \text{inv } S \text{ as } \mathbf{c} \text{ stabilizes } \mathbf{p}_0} \in \text{inv } S, \\ B &:= (-\mathbf{n}_p\mathbf{d}_{p,0} + \mathbf{d}_{p,0}\mathbf{d}_p)\cdot(\mathbf{d}_{p,0}^*\mathbf{n}_c + \mathbf{n}_{p,0}^*\mathbf{d}_c). \end{aligned}$$

From (4.3), we know that $\|A^{-1}B\|_{S,\infty} < 1$. Since

$$(\mathbf{n}_p\mathbf{n}_c - \mathbf{d}_p\mathbf{d}_c)\underbrace{(|\mathbf{n}_{p,0}|^2 + |\mathbf{d}_{p,0}|^2)}_{\in \text{inv } S} = A + B = \underbrace{A(1 + A^{-1}B)}_{\text{inv } S},$$

it follows that $\mathbf{n}_p\mathbf{n}_c - \mathbf{d}_p\mathbf{d}_c \in \text{inv } S$. Define the map $H : [0,1] \to \text{inv } S$ by $H(t) = A(1+A^{-1}B)$, $t \in [0,1]$. By Proposition 2.1, $\iota(H(0)) = \iota(H(1))$. But $\iota(H(0)) = \iota(A) = \circ + \circ = \circ$, and

$$\iota(H(1)) = \iota(\mathbf{n}_p\mathbf{n}_c - \mathbf{d}_p\mathbf{d}_c) + \circ = \iota(\mathbf{n}_p\mathbf{n}_c - \mathbf{d}_p\mathbf{d}_c).$$

Consequently, $\iota(\mathbf{n}_p\mathbf{n}_c - \mathbf{d}_p\mathbf{d}_c) = \circ$. It follows from Proposition 2.7 that $\mathbf{c}$ stabilizes $\mathbf{p}$.

It is easy to check that

$$\begin{aligned}
& (\mathbf{n}_p\mathbf{n}_c - \mathbf{d}_p\mathbf{d}_c)(|\mathbf{n}_{p,0}|^2 + |\mathbf{d}_{p,0}|^2) \\
= \quad & (\mathbf{n}_{p,0}^*\mathbf{n}_p + \mathbf{d}_{p,0}^*\mathbf{d}_p)(\mathbf{n}_c\mathbf{n}_{p,0} - \mathbf{d}_c\mathbf{d}_{p,0}) + (\mathbf{n}_p\mathbf{d}_{p,0} - \mathbf{n}_{p,0}\mathbf{d}_p)(\mathbf{n}_c\mathbf{d}_{p,0}^* + \mathbf{n}_{p,0}^*\mathbf{d}_c).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus for $\varphi \in M(S)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{|\widehat{\mathbf{n}}_p(\varphi)\widehat{\mathbf{n}}_c(\varphi) - \widehat{\mathbf{d}}_p(\varphi)\widehat{\mathbf{d}}_c(\varphi)|}{\sqrt{|\widehat{\mathbf{n}}_p(\varphi)|^2 + |\widehat{\mathbf{d}}_p(\varphi)|^2}\sqrt{|\widehat{\mathbf{n}}_c(\varphi)|^2 + |\widehat{\mathbf{d}}_c(\varphi)|^2}} \\
= \quad & \left| \frac{\left(\widehat{\mathbf{n}}_{p,0}^*(\varphi)\widehat{\mathbf{n}}_p(\varphi) + \widehat{\mathbf{d}}_{p,0}^*(\varphi)\widehat{\mathbf{d}}_p(\varphi)\right)\left(\widehat{\mathbf{n}}_c(\varphi)\widehat{\mathbf{n}}_{p,0}(\varphi) - \widehat{\mathbf{d}}_c(\varphi)\widehat{\mathbf{d}}_{p,0}(\varphi)\right)}{\sqrt{|\widehat{\mathbf{n}}_p(\varphi)|^2 + |\widehat{\mathbf{d}}_p(\varphi)|^2}\sqrt{|\widehat{\mathbf{n}}_c(\varphi)|^2 + |\widehat{\mathbf{d}}_c(\varphi)|^2}\left(|\widehat{\mathbf{n}}_{p,0}(\varphi)|^2 + |\widehat{\mathbf{d}}_{p,0}(\varphi)|^2\right)} \right. \\
& \left. + \frac{\left(\widehat{\mathbf{n}}_p(\varphi)\widehat{\mathbf{d}}_{p,0}(\varphi) - \widehat{\mathbf{n}}_{p,0}(\varphi)\widehat{\mathbf{d}}_p(\varphi)\right)\left(\widehat{\mathbf{n}}_c(\varphi)\widehat{\mathbf{d}}_{p,0}^*(\varphi) + \widehat{\mathbf{n}}_{p,0}^*(\varphi)\widehat{\mathbf{d}}_c(\varphi)\right)}{\sqrt{|\widehat{\mathbf{n}}_p(\varphi)|^2 + |\widehat{\mathbf{d}}_p(\varphi)|^2}\sqrt{|\widehat{\mathbf{n}}_c(\varphi)|^2 + |\widehat{\mathbf{d}}_c(\varphi)|^2}\left(|\widehat{\mathbf{n}}_{p,0}(\varphi)|^2 + |\widehat{\mathbf{d}}_{p,0}(\varphi)|^2\right)} \right| \\
\geq \quad & (\sin\alpha)\cdot(\cos\beta) - (\cos\alpha)\cdot(\sin\beta) = \sin(\alpha - \beta),
\end{aligned}$$

where $\alpha, \beta \in [0, \pi/2]$ are such that

$$\begin{aligned}
\sin\alpha &= \frac{|-\widehat{\mathbf{n}}_{p,0}(\varphi)\widehat{\mathbf{n}}_c(\varphi) + \widehat{\mathbf{d}}_{p,0}(\varphi)\widehat{\mathbf{d}}_c(\varphi)|}{\sqrt{|\widehat{\mathbf{n}}_c(\varphi)|^2 + |\widehat{\mathbf{d}}_c(\varphi)|^2}\sqrt{|\widehat{\mathbf{n}}_{p,0}(\varphi)|^2 + |\widehat{\mathbf{d}}_{p,0}(\varphi)|^2}}, \\
\sin\beta &= \frac{|-\widehat{\mathbf{n}}_p(\varphi)\widehat{\mathbf{d}}_{p,0}(\varphi) + \widehat{\mathbf{n}}_{p,0}(\varphi)\widehat{\mathbf{d}}_p(\varphi)|}{\sqrt{|\widehat{\mathbf{n}}_p(\varphi)|^2 + |\widehat{\mathbf{d}}_p(\varphi)|^2}\sqrt{|\widehat{\mathbf{n}}_{p,0}(\varphi)|^2 + |\widehat{\mathbf{d}}_{p,0}(\varphi)|^2}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\cos\alpha &= \frac{|\widehat{\mathbf{n}}_c(\varphi)\widehat{\mathbf{d}}_{p,0}^*(\varphi) + \widehat{\mathbf{d}}_c(\varphi)\widehat{\mathbf{n}}_{p,0}^*(\varphi)|}{\sqrt{|\widehat{\mathbf{n}}_c(\varphi)|^2 + |\widehat{\mathbf{d}}_c(\varphi)|^2}\sqrt{|\widehat{\mathbf{n}}_{p,0}(\varphi)|^2 + |\widehat{\mathbf{d}}_{p,0}(\varphi)|^2}}, \\
\cos\beta &= \frac{|\widehat{\mathbf{n}}_p(\varphi)\widehat{\mathbf{n}}_{p,0}^*(\varphi) + \widehat{\mathbf{d}}_{p,0}(\varphi)\widehat{\mathbf{d}}_{p,0}^*(\varphi)|}{\sqrt{|\widehat{\mathbf{n}}_p(\varphi)|^2 + |\widehat{\mathbf{d}}_p(\varphi)|^2}\sqrt{|\widehat{\mathbf{n}}_{p,0}(\varphi)|^2 + |\widehat{\mathbf{d}}_{p,0}(\varphi)|^2}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\sin^{-1} : [0, 1] \to [0, \pi/2]$ is increasing, we obtain for $\varphi \in M(S)$,

$$\sin^{-1}\frac{|\widehat{\mathbf{n}}_p(\varphi)\widehat{\mathbf{n}}_c(\varphi) - \widehat{\mathbf{d}}_p(\varphi)\widehat{\mathbf{d}}_c(\varphi)|}{\sqrt{|\widehat{\mathbf{n}}_p(\varphi)|^2 + |\widehat{\mathbf{d}}_p(\varphi)|^2}\sqrt{|\widehat{\mathbf{n}}_c(\varphi)|^2 + |\widehat{\mathbf{d}}_c(\varphi)|^2}} \geq \alpha - \beta.$$

But

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha-\beta &= \sin^{-1}\frac{|-\widehat{\mathbf{n}}_{p,0}(\varphi)\widehat{\mathbf{n}}_c(\varphi)+\widehat{\mathbf{d}}_{p,0}(\varphi)\widehat{\mathbf{d}}_c(\varphi)|}{\sqrt{|\widehat{\mathbf{n}}_c(\varphi)|^2+|\widehat{\mathbf{d}}_c(\varphi)|^2}\sqrt{|\widehat{\mathbf{n}}_{p,0}(\varphi)|^2+|\widehat{\mathbf{d}}_{p,0}(\varphi)|^2}} \\
&\quad -\sin^{-1}\frac{|-\widehat{\mathbf{n}}_p(\varphi)\widehat{\mathbf{d}}_{p,0}(\varphi)+\widehat{\mathbf{n}}_{p,0}(\varphi)\widehat{\mathbf{d}}_p(\varphi)|}{\sqrt{|\widehat{\mathbf{n}}_p(\varphi)|^2+|\widehat{\mathbf{d}}_p(\varphi)|^2}\sqrt{|\widehat{\mathbf{n}}_{p,0}(\varphi)|^2+|\widehat{\mathbf{d}}_{p,0}(\varphi)|^2}} \\
&\geq \sin^{-1}\mu_{\mathbf{p}_0,\mathbf{c}}-\sin^{-1}\frac{|-\widehat{\mathbf{n}}_p(\varphi)\widehat{\mathbf{d}}_{p,0}(\varphi)+\widehat{\mathbf{n}}_{p,0}(\varphi)\widehat{\mathbf{d}}_p(\varphi)|}{\sqrt{|\widehat{\mathbf{n}}_p(\varphi)|^2+|\widehat{\mathbf{d}}_p(\varphi)|^2}\sqrt{|\widehat{\mathbf{n}}_{p,0}(\varphi)|^2+|\widehat{\mathbf{d}}_{p,0}(\varphi)|^2}} \\
&\geq \sin^{-1}\mu_{\mathbf{p}_0,\mathbf{c}}-\sin^{-1}d_{c,r}(\mathbf{p},\mathbf{p}_0).
\end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\sin^{-1}\mu_{\mathbf{p},\mathbf{c}}\geq\sin^{-1}\mu_{\mathbf{p}_0,\mathbf{c}}-\sin^{-1}d_{c,r}(\mathbf{p},\mathbf{p}_0). \tag{4.4}$$

For $x,y,z\in[0,1]$, if $\sin^{-1}x\leq\sin^{-1}y+\sin^{-1}z$. By taking the cosine of both sides and using that the cos is a decreasing function on $[0,\frac{\pi}{2}]$, we then get $\sqrt{1-x^2}\geq\sqrt{1-y^2}\sqrt{1-z^2}-yz$, which in turn implies that $(\sqrt{1-x^2}+yz)^2\geq(1-y^2)(1-z^2)$. Hence

$$x^2\leq y^2+z^2+2yz\sqrt{1-x^2}\leq y^2+z^2+2yz\cdot 1=(y+z)^2,$$

which gives finally that $x\leq y+z$. The claimed inequality now follows immediately from the inequality in (4.4) upon setting $x=\mu_{\mathbf{p}_0,\mathbf{c}}$, $y=d_{c,r}(\mathbf{p}_0,\mathbf{p})$ and $z=\mu_{\mathbf{p},\mathbf{c}}$. ☐

5. Specific instances of R

Table 5 below gives an overview of the choice of principal objects S,G,ι specific to choices of R as the standard classes of stable transfer functions used in control theory.

R	S	G	ι
RH^∞ $A(\mathbb{D})$, $W^+(\mathbb{D})$, $\widehat{L^1[0,\infty)}+\mathbb{C}$, $\dots$	$C(\mathbb{T})$	$\mathbb{Z}$	$f\mapsto w(f)$
$\mathcal{A}_+$	C_0+AP	$\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{Z}$	$f=f_0+f_{AP}\mapsto\Big(w_{\mathrm{av}}(f_{AP})+w(1+f_{AP}^{-1}\widehat{f}_0)\Big)$
H^∞	$\varinjlim C_b(\mathbb{A}_r)$ $\wr$ $C(\beta\mathbb{A}_0\setminus\mathbb{A}_0)$	$\mathbb{Z}$	$[(f_r)_r]\mapsto\lim\limits_{r\to 1}w(f_r)$

Table 1. Choices of S,G,ι corresponding to specific instances of R.

5.1. $R = RH^\infty, A(\mathbb{D}), W^+(\mathbb{D}), \widehat{L^1[0,\infty)} + \mathbb{C}, \cdots$.

Let

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{C}_{>0} &:= \{s \in \mathbb{C} : \mathrm{Re}(s) > 0\},\\ \mathbb{D} &:= \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| < 1\},\\ \mathbb{T} &:= \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| = 1\},\\ \overline{\mathbb{D}} &:= \mathbb{D} \cup \mathbb{T}.\end{aligned}$$

Recall that

$$\begin{aligned}RH^\infty &:= \{f : \mathbb{C}_{>0} \to \mathbb{C} : f \text{ is rational and bounded in } \mathbb{C}_{>0}\},\\ A(\mathbb{D}) &:= \{f : \overline{\mathbb{D}} \to \mathbb{C} : f \text{ is holomorphic in } \mathbb{D} \text{ and continuous in } \overline{\mathbb{D}}\},\\ W^+(\mathbb{D}) &:= \{f : f(z) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n z^n \ (z \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}) \text{ and } \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} |a_n| < +\infty\},\\ \widehat{L^1[0,\infty)} + \mathbb{C} &:= \{f : f(s) = \widehat{f_{\mathrm{a}}}(s) + f_0 \ (s \in \mathbb{C}_{>0}), \text{ where } f_{\mathrm{a}} \in L^1[0,\infty),\ f_0 \in \mathbb{C}\}.\end{aligned}$$

In the above, $\widehat{f_{\mathrm{a}}}$ denotes the Laplace transform of $f_{\mathrm{a}} \in L^1[0,\infty)$.

In each of these cases, the values of the function on the boundary of the domain of definition gives rise to a function which can be considered to be an element of the C^*-algebra

$$S := C(\mathbb{T}) := \{f : \mathbb{T} \to \mathbb{C} : f \text{ is continuous on } \mathbb{T}\}.$$

We take $G = \mathbb{Z}$, and $\iota : \text{inv } C(\mathbb{T}) \to \mathbb{Z}$ to be the winding number w with respect to the origin:

$$\iota(f) := w(f), \quad f \in \text{inv } C(\mathbb{T}).$$

Then it can be checked that (A1)-(A3) hold. Most of the details can be found in [1], except for (I5), but this verification is obvious. Moreover, the $\|\cdot\|_{S,\infty}$-norm in the definition of the $d_{c,r}$-metric is the usual supremum $\|\cdot\|_\infty$-norm of functions in $C(\mathbb{T})$.

5.2. $R = \mathcal{A}_+$.

Recall that

$$\mathcal{A}^+ = \left\{ s(\in \mathbb{C}_{>0}) \mapsto \widehat{f_{\mathrm{a}}}(s) + \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a_k e^{-st_k} \;\middle|\; \begin{array}{l} f_{\mathrm{a}} \in L^1[0,\infty),\ (a_k)_{k\geq 0} \in \ell^1, \\ 0 = t_0 < t_1, t_2, t_3, \ldots \end{array} \right\}$$

Let

$$\begin{aligned}C_0 &:= \{f : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{C} : f \text{ is continuous on } \mathbb{R} \text{ and } \lim_{x\to\pm\infty} f(x) = 0\}\\ AP &:= \text{closed span in } L^\infty(\mathbb{R}) \text{ of } \{(\mathbb{R} \ni)x \mapsto e^{i\lambda x} : \lambda \in \mathbb{R}\}.\end{aligned}$$

$C_0 + AP$, endowed with pointwise operations, with the supremum norm, and with involution given by pointwise complex conjugation, is a sub-C^*-algebra of $L^\infty(\mathbb{R})$; [3]. We will take $S := C_0 + AP$. Moreover, we take $G = \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{Z}$, and define $\iota : \text{inv } (C_0 + AP) \to \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{Z}$ by

$$\iota(f) = \Big(w_{\mathrm{av}}(f_{AP}),\ w(1 + f_{AP}^{-1} f_0)\Big), \quad f = f_0 + f_{AP} \in \text{inv } (C_0 + AP),\ f_0 \in C_0,\ f_{AP} \in AP.$$

In the above, $w_{\text{av}} : \text{inv } AP \to \mathbb{R}$ denotes the average winding number, defined by

$$w_{\text{av}}(f_{AP}) := \lim_{x \to +\infty} \frac{\arg(f(x)) - \arg(f(-x))}{2x}, \quad f_{AP} \in \text{inv } AP,$$

see [5, Theorem 1, p. 167]. Again, it can be checked that (A1)-(A3) hold; see [1]. Since $C_0 + AP$ is a sub-C^*-algebra of $L^\infty(\mathbb{R})$, the $\|\cdot\|_{S,\infty}$-norm in the definition of the $d_{c,r}$-metric is the usual $\|\cdot\|_\infty$-norm of functions in $L^\infty(\mathbb{R})$.

5.3. $R = H^\infty$**.** The Hardy algebra H^∞ consists of all bounded and holomorphic functions defined on the open unit disk $\mathbb{D} := \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| < 1\}$, with pointwise operations and the usual supremum norm. We recall the construction of S from [4]. For given $r \in (0,1)$, let

$$\mathbb{A}_r := \{z \in \mathbb{C} : r < |z| < 1\}$$

denote the open annulus and let $C_b(\mathbb{A}_r)$ be the C^*-algebra of all bounded and continuous functions $f : \mathbb{A}_r \to \mathbb{C}$, equipped with pointwise operations and the supremum norm. Moreover, for $0 < r \le R < 1$ we define the map $\pi_r^R : C_b(\mathbb{A}_r) \to C_b(\mathbb{A}_R)$ by restriction:

$$\pi_r^R(f) = f|_{\mathbb{A}_R}, \quad f \in C_b(\mathbb{A}_r).$$

Consider the family $\big(C_b(\mathbb{A}_r), \pi_r^R\big)$ for $0 < r \le R < 1$. We note that

(i) π_r^r is the identity map on $C_b(\mathbb{A}_r)$, and
(ii) $\pi_r^R \circ \pi_\rho^r = \pi_\rho^R$ for all $0 < \rho \le r \le R < 1$.

Now consider the $*$-algebra

$$\prod_{r \in (0,1)} C_b(\mathbb{A}_r),$$

and denote by $\mathcal{A}$ its $*$-subalgebra consisting of all elements $f = (f_r) = (f_r)_{r \in (0,1)}$ such that there is an index r_0 with $\pi_r^R(f_r) = f_R$ for all $0 < r_0 \le r \le R < 1$. Since every π_r^R is norm decreasing, the net $(\|f_r\|_\infty)$ is convergent and we define

$$\|f\| := \lim_{r \to 1} \|f_r\|_\infty.$$

Clearly this defines a seminorm on $\mathcal{A}$ that satisfies the C^*-norm identity, that is,

$$\|f^* f\| = \|f\|^2,$$

where $\cdot^*$ is the involution, that is, complex conjugation, see (5.2) below. Now, if N is the kernel of $\|\cdot\|$, then the quotient $\mathcal{A}/N$ is a C^*-algebra (and we denote the norm again by $\|\cdot\|$). This algebra is the *direct/inductive limit* of $(C_b(\mathbb{A}_r), \pi_r^R)$ and we denote it by

$$\varinjlim C_b(\mathbb{A}_r).$$

To every element $f \in C_b(\mathbb{A}_{r_0})$, we associate a sequence $f_1 = (f_r)$ in $\mathcal{A}$, where

$$f_r = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } 0 < r < r_0, \\ \pi_{r_0}^r(f) & \text{if } r_0 \le r < 1. \end{cases} \tag{5.1}$$

We also define a map $\pi_r : C_b(\mathbb{A}_r) \to \varinjlim C_b(\mathbb{A}_r)$ by

$$\pi_r(f) := [f_1], \quad f \in C_b(\mathbb{A}_r),$$

where $[f_1]$ denotes the equivalence class in $\varinjlim C_b(\mathbb{A}_r)$ which contains f_1. We will use the fact that the maps π_r are in fact $*$-homomorphisms. We note that these maps are compatible with the connecting maps π_r^R in the sense that every diagram shown below is commutative.

$$\begin{tikzcd}
C_b(\mathbb{A}_r) \arrow[r, "\pi_r^R"] \arrow[dr, "\pi_r"'] & C_b(\mathbb{A}_R) \arrow[d, "\pi_R"] \\
 & \varinjlim C_b(\mathbb{A}_r)
\end{tikzcd}$$

Then $\varinjlim C_b(\mathbb{A}_r)$ is a C^*-algebra, see [2, Section 2.6]. The multiplicative identity arises from the constant function $f \equiv 1$ in $C_b(\mathbb{A}_0)$, that is, $\pi_0(f)$. Moreover, we can define an involution in $C_b(\mathbb{A}_r)$ by setting

$$(f^*)(z) := \overline{f(z)}, \quad z \in \mathbb{A}_r, \tag{5.2}$$

and this implicitly defines an involution of elements in $\varinjlim C_b(\mathbb{A}_r)$. There is a natural embedding of H^∞ into $\varinjlim C_b(\mathbb{A}_r)$, namely

$$f \mapsto \pi_0(f) : H^\infty \longrightarrow \varinjlim C_b(\mathbb{A}_r). \tag{5.3}$$

We will take $G = \mathbb{Z}$. For $f \in \text{inv }(C_b(\mathbb{A}_\rho))$ and for $0 < \rho < r < 1$ we define the map $f^r : \mathbb{T} \to \mathbb{C}$ by $f^r(\zeta) = f(r\zeta)$, $\zeta \in \mathbb{T}$. If $f \in \text{inv }(C_b(\mathbb{A}_\rho))$, then $f^r \in \text{inv }(C(\mathbb{T}))$, and so f^r has a winding number $w(f_r)$. We set $w(f) := w(f^r) \in \mathbb{Z}$ with respect to 0, and it can be shown that this is well-defined. Now we define the map $\iota : \text{inv }(\varinjlim C_b(\mathbb{A}_r)) \to \mathbb{Z}$. For $[(f_r)] \in \text{inv }(\varinjlim C_b(\mathbb{A}_r))$,

$$\iota(f) := \lim_{r \to 1} w(f_r), \text{ for } f = [(f_r)] \in \text{inv }(\varinjlim C_b(\mathbb{A}_r)). \tag{5.4}$$

It can be shown that ι is well-defined and all the properties we demand are satisfied; see [4]. It was also shown there that $\varinjlim C_b(\mathbb{A}_r)$ is isometrically isomorphic to $C(\beta\mathbb{A}_0 \setminus \mathbb{A}_0)$ (where

$$\beta\mathbb{A}_0 := \text{Stone-Čech compactification of } \mathbb{A}_0,$$

which is the maximal ideal space of the Banach algebra $C_b(\mathbb{A}_0)$ of all complex-valued bounded continuous functions on $\mathbb{A}_0$), and moreover $\varinjlim C_b(\mathbb{A}_r)$ is a sub-C^*-algebra of $L^\infty(\mathbb{T})$. From here we see that the $\|\cdot\|_{S,\infty}$-norm in the definition of the $d_{c,r}$-metric is the usual $\|\cdot\|_\infty$-norm of functions in $L^\infty(\mathbb{R})$.

6. An example

As an illustration, we consider [6, Example 4.3], namely

$$\mathbf{p}_1 = \frac{1}{s - e^{-s}}.$$

It was shown in [6] that an algebraic spectral factorization leading to normalized coprime factors is not possible in this example. So calculating the ν-metric between this plant and a perturbed one, say

$$\mathbf{p}_a := \frac{1}{s - ae^{-s}},$$

is problematic. Nevertheless, there exists a coprime factorization of

$$\mathbf{p}_a = \frac{\mathbf{n}_a}{\mathbf{d}_a}$$

over H^∞ of the half-plane $\mathbb{C}_{>0}$, where

$$\mathbf{n}_a := \frac{1}{1+s}, \quad \mathbf{d}_a := \frac{s - ae^{-s}}{1+s}.$$

That this is a coprime factorization over H^∞ follows from the Corona Theorem. Indeed, we first that

$$\lim_{\substack{s\in\mathbb{C}_{>0}\\ s\to\infty}} \left(\left|\frac{1}{1+s}\right| + \left|\frac{s-ae^{-s}}{1+s}\right| \right) = 1. \tag{6.1}$$

Thus

$$\epsilon := \inf_{s\in\mathbb{C}_{>0}} \left(\left|\frac{1}{1+s}\right| + \left|\frac{s-ae^{-s}}{1+s}\right| \right)$$

exists, and moreover we can see that $\epsilon > 0$ thanks to (6.1) and the fact that for all $s \in \mathbb{C}_{>0}$,

$$\left|\frac{1}{1+s}\right| > 0.$$

We will see that using this coprime factorization, we can compute $d_{c,r}(\mathbf{p}_a, \mathbf{p}_1)$ fairly easily. We remark also that $\mathbf{p}_a$ is the transfer function associated with the retarded delay differential equation

$$\left. \begin{array}{rcl} x'(t) & = & a\cdot x(t-1) + u(t), \\ y(t) & = & x(t) \end{array} \right\}, \quad t \geq 0.$$

For $s \in \mathbb{C}_{>0}$, and with $a =: 1+\delta$, we have

$$\overline{\mathbf{n}_1(s)}\cdot \mathbf{d}_a(s) + \overline{\mathbf{d}_1(s)}\cdot \mathbf{n}_a(s) = \underbrace{\frac{1}{|1+s|^2} + \frac{|s-e^{-s}|^2}{|1+s|^2}}_{=:f_1(s)} - \delta \cdot \underbrace{\frac{e^{-s}(\overline{s} - e^{-\overline{s}})}{|1+s|^2}}_{=:f_2(s)}.$$

It is easy to see that since $\lim\limits_{\substack{s\in\mathbb{C}_{>0}\\ s\to\infty}} f_1(s) = 1$, and for all $s\in\mathbb{C}_{>0}$, $f_1(s) \geq \dfrac{1}{|1+s|^2} > 0$, we have

$$m := \inf_{s\in\mathbb{C}_{>0}} f_1(s) > 0.$$

Also, $\lim\limits_{\substack{s\in\mathbb{C}_{>0}\\ s\to\infty}} f_2(s) = 0$, and so

$$M := \sup_{s\in\mathbb{C}_{>0}} |f_2(s)| < +\infty.$$

Consequently for all $\delta = a-1$ small enough, for example, $|\delta| = |a-1| < \dfrac{m}{2(M+1)}$, we have

$$\mathrm{Re}\Big(\overline{\mathbf{n}_1(s)}\cdot \mathbf{d}_a(s) + \overline{\mathbf{d}_1(s)}\cdot \mathbf{n}_a(s)\Big) > m - |\epsilon| M > m - \frac{m}{2(M+1)}\cdot M > m - \frac{m}{2} = \frac{m}{2} > 0.$$

So the condition that $\mathbf{n}_1^*\mathbf{d}_a + \mathbf{d}_1^*\mathbf{n}_a \in \operatorname{inv} S$ and $\iota(\mathbf{n}_1^*\mathbf{d}_a + \mathbf{d}_1^*\mathbf{n}_a) = \circ$ will be satisfied for all such values of the parameter a. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} d_{c,r}(\mathbf{p}_1, \mathbf{p}_a) &= \sup_{y\in\mathbb{R}} \frac{|\mathbf{n}_1(iy)\mathbf{d}_a(iy) - \mathbf{d}_1(iy)\mathbf{n}_a(iy)|}{\sqrt{|\mathbf{n}_1(iy)|^2 + |\mathbf{d}_1(iy)|^2}\sqrt{|\mathbf{n}_a(iy)|^2 + |\mathbf{d}_a(iy)|^2}} \\ &= \frac{\dfrac{|a-1|}{1+y^2}}{\sqrt{\dfrac{1+y^2+1+2y\sin y}{1+y^2}}\sqrt{\dfrac{1+y^2+a^2+2ay\sin y}{1+y^2}}} \\ &= \frac{|a-1|}{\sqrt{2(1+a^2)}}. \end{aligned}$$

References

[1] J.A. Ball and A.J. Sasane. Extension of the ν-metric. *Complex Analysis and Operator Theory*, 6:65-89, 2012.

[2] *Lectures on operator theory.* Edited by R. Bhat, G.A. Elliott, P.A. Fillimore. Fields Institute Monographs, 13, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1999.

[3] R.G. Douglas. On the C^*-algebra of a one-parameter semigroup of isometries. *Acta Mathematica*, 128:143-151, no. 3-4, 1972.

[4] M. Frentz and A.J. Sasane. Reformulation of the extension of the ν-metric for H^∞. *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications* , 401:659-671, no. 2, 2013.

[5] B. Jessen and H. Tornehave. Mean motions and zeros of almost periodic functions. *Acta Mathematica*, 77:137-279, 1945.

[6] J.R. Partington and G.K. Sankaran. Algebraic construction of normalized coprime factors for delay systems. *Mathematics of Control, Signals, and Systems*, 15:1-12, 2002.

[7] W. Rudin. *Functional analysis*. Second Edition. Tata McGraw-Hill, New Delhi, 2006.

[8] A.J.Sasane. A Generalized Chordal Metric in Control Theory Making Strong Stabilizability a Robust Property. *Complex Analysis and Operator Theory*, to appear.

[9] S. Treil. A counterexample on continuous coprime factors. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, no. 6, 39:1262-1263, 1994.

[10] G. Vinnicombe. Frequency domain uncertainty and the graph topology. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, no. 9, 38:1371-1383, 1993.

Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Science, Lund University, Sweden.
E-mail address: `amol.sasane@math.lu.se`